



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,725	06/07/2000	Shusaku Uchibori	F-10190	8888

21254 7590 03/24/2005

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/588,725

Applicant(s)

UCHIBORI, SHUSAKU

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/04, 6/7/00.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination. (Original claims were numbered 1-15 but claim 10 was listed twice thus claims were renumbered 1-16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda (JP 8-314739) (As cited on IDS filed on 10/29/04).
3. As per claims 1, 10 and 14 Maeda teaches task processing system comprising:
 - a storage for storing an one or more event identifiers for an event of a plurality of events (abstract; sections 18-20);
 - a task control device for creating a task based on said event (sections 18-20);
 - a task processing device for executing a plurality of tasks (sections 18-20); and
 - whereupon completing a first task of said plurality of tasks said task processing device initiates a search for another identifier and if said another identifier is the same as said

one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task then processes a second task which is the same as said first task (sections 18-20).

4. Claims 2-9,11-13 and 15-16 are rejected based on the same grounds as claims 1, 10, and 14 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 -16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imanishi et al (6,243,735) (hereinafter Imanishi) in view of Dessloch et al (6,338,056) (hereinafter Dessloch).

7. As per claim 1, Imanishi teaches the invention substantially as claims including a task processing system comprising:

a storage for storing an one or more event identifiers for an event of a plurality of events (col. 5 lines 1-20);

a task control device for creating a task based on said event (col. 4, lines 40-50); and

a task processing device for executing a plurality of tasks (col. 4, lines 43-60) .

8. Imanishi does not specifically teach the use of the same event identifier and searching for the identifier.

Dessloch teaches a system whereupon completing a first task of said plurality of tasks said task processing device initiates a search for another identifier and if said another identifier is the same as said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task then processes a second task which is the same as said first task (col. 12, lines 12-25; col. 12, lines 54-57; col. 13, lines 47-62).

9. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Dessloch and Imanishi because Dessloch's method of searching for the same identifier would improve Imanishi system by save resources and time for the same events.

10. As per claim 2, Dessloch teaches a task processing system wherein a first resources used by said first task which has been completed is or are released from said task processing device toward said storage when said another identifier is not the same as said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task (col. 12, lines 12-25).

11. As per claim 3, Imanishi teaches a task processing system wherein said first resource is released from said storage, when said first resource is transferred from said storage means via said task control device to said task processing device (col. 1, lines 43-60; col. 3, lines 10-39).

12. As per claim 4, Imanishi teaches task processing system wherein:

said storage stores said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task identifier, which is executed by said task processing device (col. 5, lines 9-20).

Dessloch teaches a task control device executes a search for said one or more event identifier corresponding to said first task in order to create said second task, which is the same as said first task and executes said task after completing said first task (col. 12, lines 12-25; col. 12, lines 54-57; col. 13, lines 47-62).

13. As per claim 5, Dessloch teaches whereupon completing said first task, said processing device deletes one of said one or more event identifiers corresponding to said first task from said storage (col. 12, lines 12-25).

14. As per claim 6, Imanishi teaches wherein said storage includes a task resource storing unit (col. 4, lines 39-60).

15. As per claim 7, Dessloch teaches wherein said task control device includes an event checker that identifies said one or more event identifiers for each task of said plurality of tasks (col. 12, lines 12-25; col. 12, lines 54-57; col. 13, lines 47-62).

16. As per claim 8, Dessloch teaches wherein said task control device includes a task creator that creates a task corresponding to one of said one or more event identifiers (col. 12, lines 54-57; col. 13, lines 47-62).

17. As per claim 9, Imanishi, wherein said task control device includes a task resource manager that transfers a task resource, corresponding to said one of said one or more event identifiers, to said task processing unit (col. 5, lines 1-20).

18. Claim 10 is rejected based on the same rejection as claim 1 above.

19. Claims 11-12 are rejected based on the same rejections as claims 5-6 above.

20. Claim 13 is rejected based on the same rejection as claims 7-9 above.

21. As per claim 14, Imanishi teaches a method of processing a task, comprising:
processing a first task with a first task resource (col. 1, lines 43-60; col.4, lines 39-50).

Dessloch teaches deleting a first event identifier, corresponding to said first task from an event storing unit, upon completion of said processing (col.12, lines 13-20); and processing a second task with said first task resource, if a second event identifier, stored in said event storing unit, is the same as said first event identifier (col. 12, lines 5-40).

22. As per claim 15, Imanishi teaches a method further comprising: writing a second task resource into a processing unit, if said second event identifier is not the same as said first event identifier (col. 5, lines 35-46).

23. As per claim 16, Dessloch teaches a method further comprising initially storing a first event and said first event identifier in said event storing unit; and creating said first task corresponding to said first event (col. 12, lines 5-40).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/29/04 with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

25. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2127

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2127

NS
March 18, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100